



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	О.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/761,312		01/22/2004	Marcel Huard	12296-17US-3 IC/lil	12296-17US-3 IC/lil 3102	
20988	7590	02/03/2005		EXAMINER		
	RENAU	LT LEGE AVENUE	PIERCE, WILLIAM M			
SUITE 16		ELGE AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MONTRE	MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3					
CANADA	A			DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$\overline{}$ ϵ'
	10/761,312	HUARD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William M Pierce	3711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover shet wit	th the correspondence addres	SS
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 136(a). In no event, however, may a resply within the statutory minimum of thirty d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON to the cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. FHS from the mailing date of this commu ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	September 2004.		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal matte	• •	rits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-27 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Apportity documents have been r	oplication No	je
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		eceived.	
	,		
Attachment(s)			!
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su	ي المنظم الم Immary (PTO-413)	ı
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		,

Application/Control Number: 10/761,312

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,769,693. This is a double patenting rejection.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the steps of the claimed method must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Such subject matter can readily be shown by way of a flow chart.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abevance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/761,312

Art Unit: 3711

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9, 14, 15, 17,18 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen 2001/0015529.

As to claim 1, 22, 23-26, Allen shows displaying cards from a standard deck (ln. 1 of Abstract, recording a bet ([0019], ln. 9), drawing at random ([0063], ln. 1), calculating a payout from his TABLE 3.

From fig. 1, Allen shows a 4x12 grid of 48 gaming bets as required by claim 2. As to claims 3-7, fig. 1 show bets with respect to ranges, color, parity and suit. As to claims 8 and 9, the "high" and "low' bets are considered to be recording a securing bet. As to claims 14, 15, 17, 18 and 27, the King cards of Allen are considered "outside cards" in which all bets lose when the card is drawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Baker.

As to claim 16 the addition of a free turn card in card games to add interest to the game would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. For example see Baker in which the Gold card allows a player to bet again. As to claims 18-21, the choice of cards to allow a wager on and those to identify as "outside cards" are considered an obvious matter of design choice.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Beltran, Astancha, Jones, Porto and Berman show wagering games.

Any inquiry concerning this communication and its merits should be directed to William Pierce at E-mail

Application/Control Number: 10/761,312 Page 4

Art Unit: 3711

address bill.pierce@USPTO.gov or at telephone number (571) 272-4414.

For **official fax** communications to be officially entered in the application the fax number is (703) 872-9306.

For informal fax communications the fax number is (703) 308-7769.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the **status** of this application or proceeding can also be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Any inquiry concerning the **drawings** should be directed to the Drafting Division whose telephone number is (703) 305-8335.